

FILE

3

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV

2010 FEB -4 PM 12: 51

PUCO

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio

In response to your letter
to me dated January 25, 2010
case number 09-1086-EL-C55
between Robert Jarry vs Ohio
Edison.

I have been very explicit
to my claim against Ohio Edison
which the commission should
have in their files.

This is not an issue that
should be taken lightly by
the commission as it affects
all the citizens of the state of
Ohio. any more information that
I send would be more bills
from Ohio Edison with the
same overcharges that they have
sent previously Sincerely yours
Robert Jarry
copy to Matt Sundy

This is to certify that the images appearing are an
accurate and truthful representation of the file
contents reflected in the regular course of business.
Technician Sam Date Processed FEB 04 2010

BEFORE

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Complaint of Robert C.)
Tarry, Sr.,)
)
Complainant,)
)
v.)
)
Ohio Edison Company,)
)
Respondent.)

Case No. 09-1086-EL-CSS

ENTRY

The attorney examiner finds:

- (1) On November 10, 2009, Robert C. Tarry, Sr. (Mr. Tarry or complainant) filed a complaint against Ohio Edison Company (Ohio Edison or company). In his complaint, Mr. Tarry stated that Ohio Edison should not be charging him or anyone else for electricity that they have not distributed. Further, Mr. Tarry listed two properties that he owns and the kilowatt usage at each property. Mr. Tarry indicated that the minimal kilowatt usage at his properties was disproportionate when compared to the amount that he paid for electric service.
- (2) On November 30, 2009, Ohio Edison filed an answer to the complaint and a motion to dismiss.
- (3) By entry issued December 9, 2009, the attorney examiner requested that the complainant provide a more definite statement of the facts that led him to allege that Ohio Edison has improperly charged him for electric service, and a response to Ohio Edison's motion to dismiss, by December 24, 2009.
- (4) To date, the complainant has not provided a more definite statement or a response to Ohio Edison's motion to dismiss. Nor has the complainant offered any reasons for failing to abide by the December 9, 2009, entry. At a minimum, the complainant should provide a clear and concise statement of the facts underlying the complaint, including the service or

services at issue, by February 5, 2010. If the complainant does not file such a statement by February 5, 2010, the attorney examiner will recommend to the Commission that the complaint be dismissed.

It is, therefore,

ORDERED, That the complainant file, on or before February 5, 2010, a clear and concise statement of the facts underlying the complaint, including the service or services at issue. It is, further,

ORDERED, That a copy of this entry be served upon each party and interested person of record.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

Kerry K. Sheets
By: Kerry K. Sheets
Attorney Examiner

GRJ
/vrm

Entered in the Journal

JAN 25 2010

Renee J. Jenkins

Renee J. Jenkins
Secretary